

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Response is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed February 9, 2007, in the present application.

Claims 1-11 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Novakov, U.S. Patent No. 6,571,103 in view of Pombo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,799,256. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 require that the base station respond to the physical address inquiry packet addressed to the radio mobile terminal as an agent for the mobile terminal to solve the physical address inquiry, when the packet concerning the physical address inquiry is found.

Novakov is drawn to establishing a communication link between a local station, such as a public switched telephone network (PSTN) access point, and a Bluetooth transceiver. As discussed in the previous written responses, Novakov discloses establishing a communication link between a telecommunications network and a mobile station via a local station (Novakov, Abstract), for example using communication protocol establishing a piconet between the local station 10 acting as a master and the mobile station 26 acting as a slave according to the Bluetooth standard (Novakov, column 5, lines 24-28). Novakov discloses that the local station 10 sends an activation code to the mobile station 26 which eventually causes the mobile station to end its power saving mode and to resume an active or working mode of operation (Novakov, column 7, lines 29-34; Fig. 2).

The Examiner now acknowledges that Novakov does not disclose the above-noted features of the independent claims of the present application, however, the Examiner alleges that Pombo discloses such features.

Pombo discloses a battery conservation mode for a mobile communication device wherein the communication device maintains historical records of control channel and call activity, and this historical data is used to predict calls so that the communication device enters the power conservation mode for the battery when no call activity is likely (Pombo, Abstract). Pombo

discloses a user mobility process performed by the mobile station in which signal quality information is received, such as received signal strength indication (RSSI), to identify a current best base (CBB) station (Pombo, column 7, lines 1-5), according to the results of which the mobile station 104 selects the control frequency returned by the request control channel process as part of the mobile station's determination of the optimal base station based on the RSSI information received for various base stations.

Accordingly, Pombo does not disclose or suggest processing performed by the base station as an agent for the radio mobile terminal concerning packets received for the mobile terminal. Further, Pombo is silent with respect to solving the physical address inquiry when a broadcast packet concerning a physical address inquiry is found that is addressed to the radio mobile terminal. Therefore, even taken together in combination, Pombo and Novakov do not even remotely disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9.

Moreover, Novakov and Pombo do not address the problems recognized and solved by applicant's claimed invention, including the problem of power management in the mobile terminal when a base station receives a physical address inquiry packet addressed to the mobile terminal. As discussed in the Amendment filed October 6, 2006, according to an aspect of applicant's claimed invention, the base station can respond to the physical address inquiry packet received addressed to the mobile terminal, acting as an agent on behalf of the mobile terminal. Accordingly, the power saving mode in the mobile terminal may be uninterrupted because the base station performs the above-discussed processing. Therefore, the recitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 would not have been obvious from Pombo and Novakov.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 depend from the foregoing claims and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Response or regarding the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-provided telephone number.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON APRIL 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700